

THE SOUTH AND THE NORTH:

BEING

A REPLY TO A LECTURE

ON

THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH,

BY ELLWOOD FISHER,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE YOUNG MEN'S MERCANTILE
LIBRARY ASSOCIATION OF CINCINNATI,

JANUARY 16, 1849.

BY A CAROLINIAN.

WASHINGTON:
BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.
1849.

THE SOUTH AND THE NORTH.

The disparity in the wealth and prosperity, the population and progress, of the Northern and Southern States, has been the standing topic of remark for a quarter of a century. The Tourist has noted it in his memorandum-book; the Statesman has deplored it in strains of eloquence; the Political Economist has essayed to account for it; even the most unobserving traveller, who passes from one section to the other, is forcibly struck with the immense superiority of the North over the South, in all the elements of social advancement. Northern men have reminded us of it; Southern men have admitted, lamented, apologized for it—all, in turn, have used it "to point a moral or adorn a tale."

Men had imagined, on the one hand, that in travelling through the free States they almost everywhere saw the spires of the village church rise up before them, surrounded by fruitful fields and farms, and a busy, thriving, happy people, enjoying a degree of wealth and prosperity unrivalled in the history of the world. They thought they saw the smoke rise from the engine pipes, or the furnaces, of a thousand manufactories; or heard the water-wheel which gave motion to the machinery. In certain localities near the seashore, at the head of bays, or upon the large rivers, splendid cities would spring up, teeming with hundreds of thousands of people; their harbors and river sides would appear to the fancy to be studded with masts and whitened with sails, or lined with steamers. In fine, they supposed themselves transported from city to city, from State to State, with the speed of the winds.

On the other hand, when they crossed over to the other side of Mason and Dixon's line, objects began to be dwarfed and distorted by the same capricious fancy which had magnified and illuminated those further north. Cities began to dwindle and disappear; the towns grew meager and dilapidated in appearance; and the whole country wore an aspect of desolation in comparison with the free States. In some places, particularly upon the seaboard of Virginia and the Carolinas, large counties and districts, which have been settled for generations, appeared to the forlorn and fainting traveller entirely destitute of towns and villages, where the accommodations of "mine inn," and the attentions of "mine host," might have solaced him for the fatigues of his journey. In passing along the highways, as they are called, he attracted universal observation, as if the visits of the stranger, like those of angels, were "few and far between." What is more strange, this *mirage*, for so we must now call it, was universal, and bewildered and misled equally Northern men and Southern men, foreigners and natives. Even the census takers and assessors of property, the geographers and chroniclers of passing events, were not free from its influence, but made out tables, and charts, and maps, all going to confirm the public mind in preconceived opinions.

But the race of this figment of the brain, this chimera, which has been generated by a combination of Yankee conceit and presumption, with Southern modesty, and self-abasement, is now forever exploded and cast to the winds, by the good right arm of one man, who has remained free from the in-

fatuation. Mr. Ellwood Fisher utterly denies, and to his own satisfaction disproves, the alleged superiority of the North over the South, in wealth and prosperity; and I observe that Southern journals, printed on Northern types and paper, have republished the Lecture of Mr. F., with comments showing the ecstatic frame of mind of their editors at the discovery of this great truth—a truth, by the way, of which they have a thousand times denied the existence. The achievements of Don Quixote become tame beside the Herculean labor of Mr. Fisher; and I know of nothing in the way of literary daring to compare to it, unless it be the treatise of Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, in which he attempts to controvert the existence of Napoleon Bonaparte! I must do the Doctor the justice to say, however, that his object was to show the absurd results which must flow from Hume's maxims in regard to the admissibility of human testimony. Discussing the question upon Hume's principles, he makes out a very plausible and highly amusing argument against the existence of the French Emperor; and confirms the saying of Sam Patch, that "some things may be done as well as others."

Regarding Mr. Fisher's pamphlet in this point of view, it is not altogether without merit; but it is not to be compared to the essay of Dr. Whately, either for ingenuity, candor, or truthfulness of statement.

In the outset, I must object to the basis of comparison adopted by the Lecturer, in estimating the relative wealth of the two sections of the Union. His plan is to divide the wealth of the free States by the whole population; while that of the slave States is divided among the white inhabitants, or by what are termed the citizens; and since the slaves are estimated as property, it is evident that, if we add the principle of Sir Robert Peel's sliding scale to this mode of calculation, we may, by diminishing the number of citizens, and increasing that of slaves, make the South the richest country in Christendom. Upon this absurd principle, the wealth of a community is inversely proportioned to the number of "citizens;" and hence a country which recognises but one citizen, as for instance Turkey, has solved the problem of Political Economy, and established that order of things which is most favorable to the creation of wealth. The Grand Turk is as completely master of the persons and property of his subjects, as any South Carolinian can pretend to be of his slaves; and his people are only stewards of his affairs, whom he dispossesses and bow-strings, without a moment's hesitation. Every man in Turkey is proud to call himself the slave of the Sultan; and their persons, no less than the property they hold on sufferance, must be regarded as part and parcel of the chattels of the great Citizen.

In ancient Rome, the privileges of citizenship were restricted to a comparatively limited number of persons; but in latter ages it was sold to any one who was able to buy. The passage in the Acts of the Apostles which relates the story of Paul's persecution at Jerusalem, is familiar to all. He claims his privilege of a Roman citizen. "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? And the Chief Captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was *free born*." This fact being ascertained, the Captain desisted from his purpose of scourging Paul. The name of "Roman citizen" was his shield. Now, it is evident that, in proportion as this privilege of citizenship became extended, the average wealth of the citizen class was diminished; and it resulted as a consequence, that though the wealth of Imperial Rome was aggregately a thousand fold greater than that of Republican Rome, yet the latter, having but few citizens to divide it among, would, upon the principles of Mr. Fisher's political economy, be the richest. Or, the iron age of Sparta, when the precious metals were excluded, and poverty made a merit, would have ranked higher in the scale of wealth than Massachusetts, because there were fewer citizens in all Laconia than in Lowell.

But why should Mr. Fisher include the poor whites in the division? They have no more interest in the accumulated wealth of the country than the negroes, and there is no more propriety in including one class than the other. He should exclude the poor whites, or include the poor blacks.

Is it not a singular mode of defending slavery, which begins with throwing the slave out of the pale of humanity—of classing him with brutish beasts—of making no provision for his sustenance? Is he not a man? Is he not part and parcel of the population?

Slaves are property in the eye of the law of the Southern States; but there are certain radical differences between this species of property and all others, which no laws can obliterate. In the first place, it is to be remarked, that there is an absolute necessity for holding the domestic animals as property, in order to secure their services. The horse will not voluntarily assume the bridle, nor the ox the yoke. They can only be induced to labor by a forced subjection and domestication. It is also to be noted, that but for this subjection of the animal creation to man, all the domestic species would long since have been destroyed by the stronger, more ferocious, but less amiable and useful kinds. Domestication, to these irrational creatures, is therefore their happiest state.

But with man, the reverse of all this is true. He is, in his lowest estate, a rational being. He thinks of the future, and perceives the necessity of providing for it. In tropical climates, where they enjoy an almost perennial harvest of fruits and vegetables, there exists but little necessity for this forethought, and we consequently find less intelligence and industry in those regions than in colder and less fruitful climes. But even in circumstances least favorable to mental and moral improvement, man has invariably asserted his infinite superiority to the highest orders of the brute creation; and though he is found in many parts of the earth to be destitute of acquired knowledge and accumulated wealth, he has, under all circumstances, displayed a capacity and inclination for the one, together with wants, natural and social, which will prompt him to acquire the other. The mere natural or physical wants of man are few and simple; but the social depend upon habit and education; they are constantly increasing in prosperous communities, and assume a thousand phases—physical, moral, intellectual, and religious.

These varied wants, springing from man's intellectual and moral nature, will ever be a sufficient incentive to labor for their gratification. It is not necessary to make a man a slave, in order to extract labor from his hands. Or if such a necessity exists as a means of obtaining the greatest amount of labor from mere savages, whose simple wants are an insufficient inducement, no such fact can be predicated of the negroes in the United States. They are not savages, in any proper sense of the word, though they are for the most part illiterate and degraded, in a moral point of view. They have no idea of living by hunting or fishing; they are acquainted with agriculture and the mechanic arts. There is a spirit of mental and moral improvement among them; many have, under every disadvantage, accumulated money sufficient to buy themselves at a high price. These are not the characteristics of savages; and it cannot be pretended that they are wanting in incentives to labor.

There is another circumstance which distinguishes slaves from other species of property. They are wealth to individuals, but not to the State. To regard the laboring population as slaves, and to make them personal chattels, subject to the laws of sale, inheritance, and bequest, is not to increase the wealth of the State or community, because nothing is thereby added to its productive resources, or to its capacity for self-defence; and the abolition of slavery in any community will not reduce the amount of wealth in it, for the same reason. Ten thousand freemen, owning one million of slaves, can produce no more sugar, cotton, wheat, or other articles, than an equal number of freemen on an equal extent of territory. Slaves have no more physical power, and certainly no stronger motives to labor, than freemen. Indeed, it is generally conceded by Southern men, that one freeman will do as much labor as two slaves. A slave has no motive to labor but fear. It is not his interest that his master should become rich; because the fact is notorious, that the slaves of small proprietors fare better than those of large planters.

In such a community as we have above supposed, ten thousand of the population have the ordinary motives and impulses to inspire energy; while a mil-

lion are deprived of them all, and are only urged forward by brute force. In a free community, all are actuated by the hope of gain, aspiration to a higher social position, self-love, and the love of one's family; and in addition to these, the fear of poverty and destitution. One slave in ten or a hundred thousand may be stimulated by a desire of purchasing his freedom; but this hope comes not to the mass. They are without hope and without motive; nothing they can do will raise them above the condition of a slave. They are impelled by force. Slaves, as property, can bear no more taxes than an equal number of free polls. In illustration of this, I can cite the fact, that in South Carolina, an average tax of about fifty-five cents is laid on slaves; while the free negroes, I suppose, of adult age, pay two dollars per head. This is fully equal to the tax paid on adult slaves, and, I incline to believe, more than equal.

If slavery adds nothing to the productive or tax-paying resources of a State, it adds nothing to the common stock of wealth. What the slaveholder gains, the slave loses. What the slaveholder is richer, the slave is poorer; and the aggregate is no greater.

In estimating the riches of a State—its capacity to feed and clothe and shelter its inhabitants—to produce, to pay taxes, or to defend itself, therefore, it is idle and fallacious to call any portion of the people property. The effect of the law of slavery, as I have remarked in a former essay on this subject, is to "distribute" wealth, not to produce it. Slave capital is unproductive. It may change hands, and the individual owner may exchange it for productive capital; but so long as it remains in the State or community, it is dead weight; it fetters, cripples, and sometimes destroys the energies of the community. It is for this reason that the South is behind the North in manufactures and commerce. The industry and energies of generations have been devoted to the accumulation of unproductive capital—capital which, if it were destroyed in a day, by the peaceful liberation of the slaves, would leave the State as much aggregate wealth and power, and ten times the energy which it now possesses. Abolition without compensation would injure individuals, and I am no advocate for it; but the aggregate wealth of the community would be the same. It would have the same houses, lands, stock, &c., as before, the same hands to work, and the same mouths to feed, as exist under the law of slavery. If the slaves in any State are valued at fifty millions, then abolition would take that sum from the slaveholder, and give it to the slave. Hence the aggregate wealth would not be diminished by the process; and hence capital invested in slavery is dead and unproductive. Or it may be said to be a monopoly, which benefits the few at the expense of the many. The French Government has a monopoly in the tobacco trade. It is the sole merchant in that article, and derives a large revenue from the trade. The Government is therefore enriched by the monopoly, but the merchants are impoverished to precisely the same extent; so that France, in her aggregate capacity, is not a whit richer than if the Government had no exclusive privilege in the case. This is not all. The monopoly prevents competition, and sets its own price upon the article. In this way the French people at large, no less than the merchant class, are great losers.

I will now review the statements and inferences of Mr. Fisher, in relation to the wealth and prosperity of the Northern and Southern States. He represents the two sections of the Union, at the era of the formation of the Constitution, as nearly equal in extent of territory. We will see how the facts stand. It will be remembered that Maine, Kentucky, and Tennessee, were at that time Territories, with sparse populations; and that Vermont, though struggling for independent existence against New York and New Hampshire, was in a condition entirely similar to the other Territories, and may be classed with them. They should all be dropped from the calculation, or all included. As to Ohio and the other Territories then belonging to the United States, they were entirely uninhabited by white men. The South has most to gain by dropping the Territories from the estimate. I use Darby's Gazetteer of the United States, dropping the fractions of a thousand. If they are too large, they are uniformly so.

NORTHERN STATES.

SOUTHERN STATES.

	Square miles.		Square miles.
The four New England	23,000	Virginia	70,000
New York	46,000	North Carolina	51,000
Pennsylvania	47,000	South Carolina	33,000
New Jersey	8,000	Georgia	62,000
		Maryland	9,000
		Delaware	2,000
	<u>124,000</u>		<u>227,000</u>

Difference in favor of the South - - - - - 103,000

So much for extent of territory. It is apparent that the States south of Mason and Dixon's line were nearly twice as great in extent as those north of it, at the period of the formation of the Constitution; instead of being "nearly equal," as stated by Mr. Fisher. But the South possessed another advantage over the North in respect to territory. It will be seen, by reference to the map, that a breadth of territory lay contiguous to the South, extending from the Ohio river to Florida—a circumstance calculated to draw emigration to that quarter, and to promote the rapid increase of States and people. On the other hand, the Northern States were bounded on the west by the narrow strip of country between Northern Virginia and Lake Erie—a frontier not equal to one-third of that which bounded the South.

The next statement of Mr. Fisher is, that the commerce of the North and South were about the same at the period in question: "The North exporting about \$9,800,540 in 1790, and the South \$9,200,000." His argument proves too much. It proves, if the amount of exports is the criterion, that the commerce of the South is *now* greater than that of the North. He confounds commerce with the objects of commerce. The South has always produced the exports; but England before the Revolution, and the North since that period, has had the commerce in them. When England did the carrying trade for the colonies, she of course brought to the seaports of Virginia and the Carolinas her manufactures in return. The South then received goods directly from Europe, but the trade was not hers. It was England's, and perhaps, to some extent, New England's. The Yankees at that period were poor, and lived more within themselves. They had little to export, and consequently imported less than the English imported into Virginia and South Carolina. I will proceed to make this apparent by incontrovertible facts.

Be Bow's Commercial Review for 1846 has a table of the imports and exports of the Colonies from the year 1700 to 1776. I refer to the volume of that year, not remembering the number. Upon this table the editor remarks as follows:

"Dividing the whole time into periods of twenty-five years each, we observe in the *first* period, that Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas, furnish almost the entire exports, and import much more largely than New York and New England. In the *second* period, New York greatly increases her imports, which still fall short of those of New England, Virginia, or Maryland, while her exports are enhanced but little. The whole exports of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, combined, did not reach the amount of those of Carolina singly. In the *third* period, Pennsylvania imported more largely than New York, but less than New England; the Southern provinces retain their rank as exporters, Carolina being still greater than New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, together; and Georgia, a new plantation, equals New York."

According to this table, then, it appears, that in the twenty-five years which preceded the Revolution, South Carolina exported more than New York, New England, and Pennsylvania! South Carolina at that period produced rice and indigo; and those being articles of value which cannot be grown in a northern climate, they found a ready market in Europe, while the productions of the Northern Colonies, being similar to those of Europe, found no market there. The North, however, even at that period, was as superior to the South in the number and tonnage of its ships as it is at this day. New England, even then,

was distinguished for commercial enterprise, the extent of her shipping, and the number and superiority of her sailors, while the South was equally conspicuous for the lack of such interests.

During the Revolution, intercourse with Europe was cut off to a great extent, by the vigilance of the English navy; but after the peace, circumstances conspired to give great activity to trade. England, France, and Spain, going to war in a few years after the acknowledgment of our independence, and our country remaining neutral, it became the common carrier of the world; and, in addition to this, a market sprung up, not only for Southern, but for Northern exports.

Had Mr. Fisher stumbled upon the facts set forth in the table referred to in the above extract from De Bow's Review, he would doubtless have inferred that the South was one of the most commercial communities in the world. But he is as unfortunate in his facts as he is erroneous in his inferences. He says: "For the first quarter of a century of the present Government, up to 1816, the South took the lead of the North in commerce; as at the end of that period the exports of the Southern States amounted to about thirty millions of dollars, which was five millions more than the Northern." "Since that period," he continues, "a great change has occurred. The harbors of Norfolk, of Richmond, of Charleston and Savannah, have been deserted for those of Philadelphia, New York, and Boston; and New Orleans is the only Southern city that pretends to rival its Northern competitors. The grass is growing in the streets of those cities of the South which originally monopolized our colonial commerce, and maintained their ascendancy in the earlier years of the Union."

It is a strange delusion into which Mr. Fisher has fallen. He refers to "Pitkin's Statistics," as his authority for the foregoing assertions: and on consulting the work, I find the reverse of all he says to be true. When he puts the South ahead, Pitkin puts her behind, and *vice versa*. He says that the exports of the South exceeded those of the North in the first quarter of a century. The reverse is true, almost to a day. The exports of the North exceeded those of the South every year from 1790 to 1814, according to his own authority, Pitkin. By the way, if there could be any doubt about the absurdity of making the gross exports the criterion of commercial prosperity, I will here mention that the same author, Pitkin, puts the matter beyond controversy, by distinguishing between the domestic and foreign exports. The former are necessarily exported from the nearest seaport town, their bulk precluding the possibility of sending them across the country for a great distance. But the exports of foreign goods would of course be from the cities which imported them. And the foreign exports would be proportioned to the imports, and may serve as an index to the commerce of the place. Pitkin furnishes tables of the foreign exports from 1802 to 1816, and those of the North are from three to four times greater than those of the South.

Again: "Since that period," (1816,) says Mr. Fisher, "a great change has occurred." "The grass is growing in the streets of those cities of the South, which originally monopolized our colonial commerce." This asserts, by implication, as strongly as the author could have done in more direct language, that, since 1816, the exports of the South have fallen behind those of the North. But the fact is just the reverse. Since that time, the Southern exports have exceeded the Northern, almost invariably; whereas, in the first quarter of a century after the Constitution was formed, the latter preponderated. From 1813 to 1821, the exports of the South exceeded those of the North; and from 1821 to 1828, those years included, the Northern exports were ahead. In 1829 and 1830, the Southern exports again went ahead of the Northern; but in 1831 and 1832 they fell behind again, by a small amount, for the last time. From 1832 to the present time, the Southern exports have exceeded those of the free States, every year, without interruption. For these facts, since 1833, which year ends Pitkin's compilations, I refer the reader to the series of the American Almanac.

Having shown the falsity of Mr. Fisher's statements, it would seem superfluous to notice the inferences he has drawn from them. He attributes the sup-

posed decline of Southern commerce to the Tariff. I have shown that the South never had a commerce; or, if it ever had any, which the Lecturer infers from the amount of exports, then the great increase of those exports would imply a great increase of commerce, and a superiority in that particular over the North; but he admits that the South at this day has no commerce.

The immediate effect of the Protective policy is to check importations; and it only reaches the export trade in its indirect effects. One would naturally suppose, therefore, that the North, and not the South, would have a right to complain of the Tariff. The North imports, the South exports. Besides, the Southern exports are of a nature not to be dispensed with by foreigners, because there is little competition with them from other quarters. The nature of Northern exports is the same as that of the productions of Europe, and, from their remoteness, the Northern States can rarely compete with Russia, Poland, and Prussia, in supplying grain to the great commercial and manufacturing cities of England. The South has much the advantage of the North, therefore, whether the policy be Free Trade or Protection.

Mr. Fisher says that the protective policy, begun in 1816, caused the decline of Southern commerce. But, as I have stated above, on the authority of Pitkin, the Southern exports exceeded the Northern from 1816 to 1821, both years inclusive. This excess of Southern exports over Northern began, in fact, with the year 1814. In 1822, the scale was turned in favor of the North, though very slightly, and continued to preponderate on that side until September, 1828, when the South again asserted its superiority. This latter change is singularly unfortunate for Mr. Fisher's theory; since the year 1828 ushered in the famous "bill of abominations." From this period forward, the South has been uniformly ahead in the amount of exports, with the exception of the years 1830 and 1831. These changes in the relative quantity of exportation from the two sections of the country, show that the Tariff has had very little to do with the matter; or, if its effects have been felt by one section more than another, the North has had the worst of it. Thus, in 1843, the South exported to the value of \$57,000,000, omitting fractions—the North only \$27,000,000; yet this was the year in which the Whig Tariff of 1842 came into operation.

In order to ascertain, with certainty, the amount of commerce enjoyed by a community, we must look at the amount of tonnage owned by it, as well as to its imports and exports. The carrying trade may be in the hands of foreigners. This was true of the imports and exports of the South before the Revolution. The carrying was done by the mother country, and since that period the South has had very little direct trade in foreign goods, while her exports have been made in Northern vessels. Thus, in 1836, the South exported to the value of \$83,000,000—the North only \$45,000,000; yet, in the same year, the Northern people built 94,000 tons of shipping, against 19,000 by the South.

The following statistics of the tonnage of the States, compiled from Niles's Register and Hazard's Magazine, confirm all I have said above. I will begin with the period in which Mr. Fisher claims for the South the greatest commercial prosperity.

A. D. 1810.

	Tons.		Tons.
New England	605,000	Delaware	8,000
New York	304,000	Maryland	144,000
Pennsylvania and New		Virginia	83,000
Jersey	142,000	North Carolina	32,000
		South Carolina	60,000
		Georgia	16,000
		Mississippi and Tennessee	13,000
<hr/>		<hr/>	
Total free	1,051,000	Total slave	356,000
<hr/>		<hr/>	

It will be seen that the tonnage of the North was within a fraction of being three times greater than that of the South; and that the two smallest slave States, which border upon the North, and have fewer slaves in proportion to

the whites, contained nearly half the Southern tonnage; that Charleston, Norfolk, Richmond, and Savannah, which are represented by Mr. Fisher as "monopolizing our colonial commerce, and maintaining their ascendancy in the earlier years of the Union," had, or rather the entire States to which they belong, had, in those palmy days, an aggregate tonnage of 159,000, while New England had nearly four times that amount, and New York twice as much. At the same period, the population of the principal cities of the North and South were as follows:

Northern Cities in 1810.

New York - - - - -	96,373
Philadelphia - - - - -	96,664
Boston - - - - -	32,250
Salem - - - - -	12,613
Providence - - - - -	10,071

Total - - - - - 247,971

Southern Cities in 1810.

Baltimore - - - - -	46,555
Charleston - - - - -	24,711
New Orleans - - - - -	17,242
Richmond - - - - -	9,735
Norfolk - - - - -	9,193

Total - - - - - 107,436

I find no mention of the population of Savannah earlier than 1836. At that period, it contained 7,776 inhabitants, and in 1810 it could not have numbered more than 3,000: yet this village is included in the list of mighty cities of the South, which "monopolized our colonial commerce, and maintained their ascendancy in the earlier years of the Union!"

I find some statistics of the registered or foreign tonnage of the several States in McGregor's Progress of America. These tables show the amount of the direct trade enjoyed by the respective States, and also the amount of the carrying trade done by them for foreign countries; but it makes no discrimination between the commerce and the carrying trade. We know, for instance, that the commerce of Massachusetts at those periods bore no proportion to that of New York. Yet the tonnage of the former exceeded that of the latter.

Registered tonnage of the Northern States.

Maine.		Mass.		N. Hamp.		Conn.		R. Island.		N. York.		N. Jer.		Penn.	
Year.	Tons.	Year.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1820	67,274	1791	95,000	10,496	18,140	17,003	41,866	1,171	53,898						
1825	80,468	1800	223,000	14,120	31,260	18,841	97,791	806	95,632						
1830	70,585	1810	352,000	24,534	22,671	28,574	188,566	17,338	109,629						
1835	101,912	1820	130,000	17,284	14,341	29,388	115,632	468	55,458						
1844	125,000	1830	215,000	9,753	14,989	21,411	110,163	573	47,979						
		1838	296,000	16,850	28,451	30,252	202,370	1,656	42,266						

Registered tonnage of the Southern States.

Delaware.		Md.		Va.		N. Carolina.		S. Carolina.		Ga.		Louisiana.		Ala.	
Year.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Year.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1791	4,283	34,492	33,239	23,248	23,856	6,759	1804	5,466	—						
1800	2,066	81,446	41,838	20,949	43,731	7,937	1810	11,386	—						
1810	1,242	90,045	45,339	26,472	43,354	12,405	1820	14,325	2,538						
1820	160	44,850	16,797	20,138	15,177	9,192	1830	13,234	1,585						
1830	143	24,450	10,061	15,277	7,043	4,359	1837	31,383	2,733						
1837	2,028	35,340	8,299	13,012	8,413	1,875									

I am unable to account for the great inequality of the commerce of the same ports, as indicated by the above tables; but this want of uniformity pervades them all. It will be remarked that the tonnage registered in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, was much greater in 1810 than in 1820. This is attributable to the fact that, during the war between England, France, and other countries, at the former period, there existed an unusual demand for American products, and, our country being neutral, possessed the carrying trade of the world; while at the latter, peace being restored, England

resumed her commercial superiority, and cut us off from it in a great measure. Virginia and South Carolina, however, as will be seen by reference to the tables, were free from this fluctuation, because they had no share in the carrying trade to lose.

It is apparent from the tables, also, that the foreign commerce of the North increased immensely from 1791 to 1838, while the South lost ground: This was the direct trade in English ships which the South lost, and not any trade of her own. The South owns more tonnage and has more commerce now than she ever had; but she now trades with the Northern States instead of Europe. It is an indirect, instead of a direct, trade; and is carried on chiefly by Northern merchants instead of English.

The following table shows the relative commercial importance of the principal cities, North and South, in 1817, before the Protective policy had time to work its miraculous destruction of what never existed, the vast commerce of the South. The table shows the tonnage owned at the several places:

<i>Northern.</i>		<i>Southern.</i>	
	Tons.		Tons.
Boston - - - - -	141,000	Baltimore - - - - -	104,000
New York - - - - -	306,000	Norfolk - - - - -	30,000
Philadelphia - - - - -	104,000	Richmond - - - - -	11,000
		Wilmington, N. Carolina	9,000
		Charleston - - - - -	7,000

The exports from the Southern States during the fiscal year 1848 amounted to the value of \$78,307,000—those of the Northern States to only \$75,723,000. To show how little the value exported from a country has to do with its commerce, carried on with its own capital, I will here copy from the last annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury the tonnage of the principal cities, on the 30th June last:

<i>Northern.</i>		<i>Southern.</i>	
	Tons.		Tons.
Boston - - - - -	285,410	Baltimore - - - - -	122,915
New Bedford - - - - -	123,318	Norfolk - - - - -	24,003
New York - - - - -	733,077	Wilmington, N. Carolina	16,246
Philadelphia - - - - -	175,221	Charleston - - - - -	21,237
Bath - - - - -	83,412	New Orleans - - - - -	225,680
Portland - - - - -	82,361	Savannah - - - - -	18,355
Waldoborough - - - - -	85,983	Mobile - - - - -	22,110

The lake and river commerce of the North excels that of the South in an equal ratio, but the details would be tedious.

I turn now to another statement of Mr. Fisher. "Even in manufactures," he remarks, the South at this period excelled the North, in proportion to the numbers of their population. "In 1810, according to the returns of the marshals of the United States, the fabrics of wool, cotton, and linen, manufactured in the Northern States, amounted to 40,344,274 yards, valued at \$21,061,525; while the South fabricated 34,786,497 yards, estimated at \$15,771,724." Mr. Fisher indulges in the following sweeping assertion, upon the strength of the foregoing facts: "Thus," he says, "after the lapse of the first quarter of a century under our present form of Government, the South had surpassed the North in commerce, in manufactures, and in the accumulation of wealth, in proportion to the number of *citizens* of the respective sections."

I have already shown how utterly false and absurd are his facts and reasonings in relation to the commerce of the country. The task of exposing his partial statements and shallow sophistries, in regard to manufactures, will be easier.

It will be seen that, in order to make out his case, he proposes to divide the cloth manufactured at the South among the "citizens"—that is to say, the white people—not leaving the negroes a shirt to their backs! I should take

Mr. Fisher to be a very credulous person, from the numberless blunders he falls into in his Lecture; and it is not improbable that he has been imposed upon by some abolitionist, who has been guilty of the pious fraud of representing the slaves as going stark naked. Or it may be that Mr. Fisher imagined that such was the case at the time when his conscientious scruples restrained him from the luxury of sweetening his tea and coffee with slave-grown sugar, and from the economy of wearing a cotton shirt. Be that as it may, I feel called upon to undeceive him, which I can do from personal observation. He may labor under equal misapprehension as to the food of negroes. I remember, when a child, to have heard that the negroes of South Carolina and Georgia were fed on cotton seed. Now, if this story ever reached Cincinnati, there can be no doubt that Mr. Fisher recorded it among the most veritable facts; and combining it with his notion of the nudity of the slaves, he naturally and properly places them out of the pale of humanity in his economics.

His benevolent heart will throb with pleasure to learn that his credulity has been imposed on, and that the negroes wear clothes and eat food, and in most other respects resemble white people in their habits. Messrs. Calhoun and McDuffie, and the late Mr. Leigh, of Virginia, contend that the slaves are better fed, clothed, and housed, than the laboring population of any country in Europe. In a word, that they receive back a larger proportion of the proceeds of their own labor. Now, whether this statement be true or not, Mr. Fisher cannot dispute the authorities. If it be true that they come in for an equal distribution of the national wealth with other laborers, then Mr. Fisher's mode of dividing the accumulated wealth, as well as the yearly products, among the "citizen" class, to the exclusion of the slaves, is absurd. If it be not true, then slavery is not the fine thing which its advocates represent it to be. If the slaves are worse fed and clothed than the starving people of Ireland, or even the poor factory laborers and common laborers of England and France, it is utterly indefensible, in this land of plenty. So far as food is concerned, I am inclined to coincide with Mr. Calhoun, that they fare better than the common laborer of Europe, though by no means so well as the trades people.

As to the cloth manufactured in 1810, so far from giving the negroes none, there is good reason to believe that they got a larger share of it, in proportion to numbers, than the whites. The cloth manufactured was for the most part coarse "homespun," such as is worn by negroes. The absurdity of the boast that the South took the lead of the North in manufactures may be inferred from the fact that North Carolina was ahead of all the other States except Georgia, in the number of yards of cloth manufactured, in proportion to population! North Carolina is not the poorest of the Southern States, though it is generally reputed so—South Carolina has that honor; but I am willing to acknowledge that it is as poor as need be. According to Mr. Fisher, its flourishing manufactures have been crippled and ruined by the Protective policy. I have travelled a good deal in North Carolina, and I am inclined to believe that I should at least stumble occasionally upon the ruins of her ancient greatness. The Lecturer would lead one to suppose that here and there, scattered over the wide domain of this ancient seat of the Arts, the traveller would witness the melancholy spectacle of toppling walls, and deserted cities, once the focus of busy life. But he would see nothing so antique or so romantic. He may see ruin and desolation, but it is in the fields and farms, which the tread of the slave has blighted.

Mr. Fisher predicated his assertion that the South was superior to the North in manufactures, upon a partial statement of facts—upon one article, cloth; and even in that he is not borne out by the facts. The population of the North in 1810 was 3,765,000—that of the South, 3,476,000. The former produced 40,344,274 yards—the latter, only 34,786,497. The proportion is in favor of the North. But in every other branch of manufactures the North more than doubled the South. The cloth manufactured at the South was almost entirely "homespun." The labor was performed entirely by females, black and white—chiefly the latter. Few men were employed in any sort of manufacturing.

The following table is from a work compiled from the marshals' returns in 1810, by Tench Coxe, under instructions of Mr. Gallatin, then Secretary of the Treasury. This table exposes the fallacy of Mr. Fisher's inferences from partial facts:

<i>Northern Manufactures in 1810.</i>		<i>Southern Manufactures in 1810.</i>	
Maine (District)	\$2,137,781	Delaware	\$990,711
Massachusetts	17,516,423	Maryland	6,553,597
New Hampshire	3,135,027	Virginia	11,447,605
Vermont	4,325,824	Kentucky	4,120,683
Rhode Island	3,079,556	North Carolina	5,323,322
Connecticut	5,900,560	East Tennessee	1,156,049
New York	14,569,136	West Tennessee	1,552,225
New Jersey	4,703,053	South Carolina	2,174,157
Pennsylvania	32,089,130	Georgia	2,743,863
	<hr/>	Orleans Territory	814,905
	87,456,500	Mississippi Territory	314,305
Ohio	1,987,370	Louisiana Territory	34,657
Indiana Territory	196,532	District of Columbia	719,400
Illinois Territory	71,703		
Michigan Territory	37,018		
	<hr/>		<hr/>
Total	89,749,123	Total	37,855,479

These facts need no comment. Instead of being superior in the amount of her manufactures in 1810, the South was less than half equal, in proportion to population!

I will now notice the statements of Mr. Fisher relative to the estimated value of property in the Northern and Southern States. He says: "The value of property in the Southern States had risen (in 1810) to \$859,574,697, (the white population being then, according to an average of the census of 1810 and that of 1820, about 2,749,795,) or about \$312 per head; whilst the property of the Northern States amounted to \$1,042,782,264 for 4,326,550 population, or only \$240 per head." I have referred to Mr. Fisher's authority, Pitkin, and I find, by adding up the value of property in the eight Northern States then in existence, and which stand at the head of the column, that their aggregate wealth is to a fraction the sum stated for the *whole* of the free States. But the Lecturer, with his usual carelessness, fails to discover that Ohio is placed at the bottom of the column; and he thus takes it from the North, and gives it to the South. Ohio was valued at \$61,347,215, and that sum must be taken from the flattering picture given of the South, and added to the other side. This error adjusted, the account stands thus: The North, \$1,104,129,479—the South, \$798,169,482. This includes the value of slaves, which Mr. Pitkin estimates to be worth the sum of \$300,000,000. I have demonstrated, in the preceding part of this essay, that though a particular class may monopolize the wages of the laborer, and hold him as a chattel, he adds nothing, as such, to the bulk of wealth in the community, any more than if he were free. The political economists have been at great pains to define the meaning of the, terms value, wealth, and the like. They hold that wealth is accumulated labor. It is something to which industry in some shape has given a value which the raw material in its natural state and place did not possess. This is true even of the precious metals and precious stones, because they have no value until they are found and dug out of the earth.

Now, it will not be pretended that slaves have had any extra polish bestowed on them by industry and art. They rather resemble Mr. Addison's "Marble in the Quarry." Or, if they have been roughly hewn out, it is only to put them to the most common purposes; and they cannot compare in value to the laboring classes of the free States. I shall therefore subtract the \$300,000,000 worth of slaves from the estimated value of Southern property. That value, including the slaves as stated above, was \$798,167,482. Taking away the value of the slaves, and we have \$498,167,482, for the real value of accumu-

lated wealth in the Southern States in 1810. Yet the population of the two sections at that period were nearly equal.

I will next notice the statements of Mr. Fisher in regard to the wealth of the several States, North and South. "If, however," he remarks, "we compare this favorite of the North (Massachusetts) with Maryland, a Southern State of similar territorial extent, and one of the least of the Southern States, we shall find the latter to be decidedly superior in wealth, in proportion to the number of her citizens. According to the census of 1840, Maryland had a free population of 380,282, and in 1847 her property was assessed at \$202,272,650. Massachusetts, in 1840, had a population of 737,699, and her property now is only \$300,000,000. Taking these two assessments as the basis of comparison, and it appears that the average property of a free person in Maryland was \$531, whilst in Massachusetts it is now, in the palmyest days she has ever seen, only \$406 per head—the freeman of Maryland being about 25 per cent. the richer."

First, as to the territorial extent. According to Darby's Gazetteer, the area of the land surface of Maryland is 9,356 square miles, and the same authority sets down Massachusetts at 7,800 square miles, of which 7,256 are land. It thus appears that Maryland is equal to Massachusetts and Rhode Island in extent of territory. But her chief advantage consists in the greatly superior fertility of her soil, her rich and abundant minerals, and the suitability of both climate and soil to the growth of tobacco—an article which, at the lowest price which it has ever sold for, is far more profitable than the production of grain. This advantage, however, by fostering slavery, has been a great drawback upon the prosperity of the State, as I will show, before disposing of the subject. The commercial advantages of Maryland, considering her central position, are naturally superior to those of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fisher states the assessed value of property in Maryland, in 1847, at \$202,272,650. There was no general assessment made in 1847, that I have been able to discover. The last assessment of which I am able to find any trace took place in 1841, when the value of property in the State was \$196,751,144.98. Since that period, assessments have taken place in Baltimore, which show an increase of about \$11,200,000. This sum, added to \$196,751,000, the valuation of 1841, would make nearly \$208,000,000. Now, if there was a general assessment in 1847, it proves, what I shrewdly suspect, that the value of property in the country has depreciated nearly as much as it has been enhanced in Baltimore. A committee of the Legislature, in 1842, stated that the rate of taxation at the previous session had been fixed on the supposition that the assessment then about to take place would raise the value of property to \$300,000,000. It was then evident to the committee that it would not exceed \$200,000,000, and the result proved that it fell short of this sum. I have not been able to find any assessment further back than 1841, but suspect, from the high anticipations that were indulged, that the old valuation was actually higher than the last. I know that, in one of the richest and most productive counties in Maryland—rich in natural resources, not in accumulated wealth—it is the general impression among the planters that the valuation is too high, and that the land is worth less than it was twenty-five or thirty years ago, notwithstanding that the populations of Baltimore and Washington, on either side of it, have doubled in that period. This view of the matter is also sustained by a fact which I will presently show, when I come to speak of Virginia: namely, that the value of land in the eastern part of the State has declined for thirty years. It is the necessary tendency of a slave country to grow poor. The land is robbed of its fruits, and little or nothing is returned in the shape of manure. This is a necessity, and not a bad habit, as some suppose. Capital is all sunk in slaves, and subsequent accumulations take the same shape.

But putting the value of property at the sum stated in the American Almanac, (and I find it likewise in Niles's Register,) viz: \$202,272,650, still we must deduct the price of the slaves, which I have shown to be no part of the national wealth. I believe that the average assessed value is not above \$150, at which rate 89,000 slaves would be worth \$13,350,000. Subtracting this

amount from \$202,272,650, and we have about \$189,000,000, as the actual value of Maryland as a community.

I will further remark, that Maryland borders on the free States, and has four free citizens to one slave. Slavery, therefore, has been held in leashing-strings by the buoyant energy of Freedom; it has not been permitted, uncontrolled, to exert its blighting and blasting influence, as I will presently show it has done in South Carolina.

It is to be noted, also, that the greatest amount of wealth and population is in those counties which contain the smallest proportion of slaves. Thus, eight counties, Alleghany, Baltimore, Frederick, Carroll, Harford, Cecil, Caroline, and Washington, contain an area of 3,952½ square miles, being a fraction over two-fifths of the territory of Maryland. Their aggregate population is 272,723, with a slave population of about 22,000. The remaining twelve counties, or thirteen, if Howard District be called a county, contain an area of 5,404 square miles, being nearly three-fifths of the State, and including the fine tobacco region, penetrated in every direction by navigable waters. With all these advantages, its population is only 196,509, of whom, about 67,000, or more than three-fourths of the whole number in the State, are slaves. But I will present the subject in the form of a table:

	Sq. Miles.	Total pop.	Slaves.	Value of property.
8 northern counties	3,952	272,723	22,000	\$145,307,517
13 southern counties	5,404	196,509	67,000	\$66,965,133

But this includes the value of slaves, which must be deducted, in proportion to the number belonging to each section. Thus, 22,000 slaves, at \$150 per head, will amount to the value of \$3,300,000, which, taken from the value of the eight northern counties, leaves \$142,007,517. The 67,000 slaves belonging to the southern counties, at the same price, are worth \$10,050,000, which, deducted from the valuation of property in that section, leaves \$46,915,133 for the true value of accumulated wealth in the three-fifths of Maryland which contain three-fourths of its slaves. Mr. Fisher cannot except to the fact that I have included Baltimore city in the northern counties, because it is a favorite theory of his, which he has attempted to establish in his Lecture, that agriculture is the most productive application of human labor; and, besides, the southern counties are penetrated and surrounded by navigable streams, which afford every facility for commerce and manufactures.

But, to oblige him, I will take Baltimore city out of the question, and then the eight northern counties, thus robbed of their brightest jewel, will still contain \$67,695,137, against \$66,965,133 in the thirteen southern counties, including the value of the slaves. But the slaves are not so valuable as so many white people to the State; and their value must be left out, in proportion to the numbers belonging to each. Baltimore city contained, in 1840, 7,595 slaves, which for convenience I will call 7,600; these must be taken from the 22,000, leaving 14,400, which, at \$150 each, are worth \$2,160,000. This amount, taken from the value of the northern counties, leaves \$65,535,137, against \$46,915,133, which is the value of the southern counties, exclusive of slaves.

Bad as this looks for the cause of slavery, it is not the worst. The northern counties have greatly improved in wealth and population since the assessment was made in 1841, while the southern have retrograded. The town of Cumberland, with the extensive manufacturing and mining in Alleghany, have sprung up since that period; and the counties along the line of Pennsylvania, as I learn, have assimilated themselves to the industrious and enterprising habits of the free States, while slavery has almost disappeared from among them. All this while the southern counties, with one or two exceptions, are getting poorer and less populous.

I will state one more fact before leaving Maryland. Eight counties of that State, seven of which are among those I have called southern, *had less population* in 1840 than in 1790! They are Kent, Caroline, Talbot, Queen Anne's, Montgomery, Prince George's, St. Mary's, and Charles; and Dorchester, another southern county, escapes from this beggarly category by 602 souls! I

refer any reader who has the curiosity to examine the subject, to the census tables, or to a table compiled and published in a recent History of Maryland, by Mr. McSherry. A new county, called Carroll, has been formed out of parts taken from Frederick and Baltimore counties; in consequence of which, the former appears to have lost ground from 1830 to 1840; but there has been no diminution of population in that quarter. Anne Arundel has been divided, since 1840, into two parts, one of which is called Howard District; but the population of the two parts is put down in the census tables as belonging to Anne Arundel. In fact, the district is not a separate county, though it has a court-house. Nearly all of the southern counties receded in population between 1830 and 1840; these are Charles, Montgomery, Prince George's, St. Mary's, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot; while Dorchester and Worcester, together, increased only about three hundred! Only one northern county, which is Caroline, receded in population between the years 1830 and 1840.

Mr. Fisher compares Maryland with Massachusetts. I have already shown that the former is equal in size to Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and much superior in natural advantages. They were planted as colonies, or settled, at the same era, Massachusetts having priority by only eleven years. The population of Maryland in 1840 was only 469,332; of whom 317,717 were whites, 62,020 free colored, and 89,495 slaves. Massachusetts, at the same period, contained 737,699 inhabitants. The last general assessment of property took place in 1840 or 1841; I have an abstract of the valuation which was printed in the latter year, and it may be that the assessment was made in that year. The aggregate value of property amounted to \$299,878,329.60—that of Maryland, at the same period, as above stated, was \$196,751,144.98, including the value of slaves. I have shown above, that while Baltimore has advanced in wealth since 1841, the other portions of the State, aggregately, must have receded, in order to account for the fact that the total valuation, in 1847, for the whole State, is less than the increase of Baltimore added to the old valuation. I have also shown, that while the northern counties have been improving, the southern or slaveholding counties have fallen back. I will now show that Massachusetts, in and out of Boston, is in a state of rapid advancement in wealth and population.

In 1841, Boston was worth only \$110,000,000—now it is ascertained by assessment to have property to the amount of \$167,000,000—here is a gain of of \$57,000,000 in one city. But, unlike Maryland, Massachusetts has been gaining in every county nearly or quite as rapidly as in Boston. This I will proceed to demonstrate.

I have before me a report of the value of property in Massachusetts, at the two last assessments, in 1831 and 1841. The following summary statement of the value of property in each county, taken from the official report, proves conclusively, that every part of the State is nearly or quite as prosperous as Boston:

Counties.	Aggregate valuation of 1831.	Agg. val. of 1841.
Suffolk - -	\$80,244,261.25	\$110,000,000.00
Essex - - -	24,335,935.57	31,110,204.00
Middlesex - -	21,182,609.00	37,592,082.00
Worcester - -	21,166,640.68	29,804,316.00
Hampshire - -	5,603,255.87	7,298,351.00
Hampden - -	6,548,342.20	10,188,423.00
Franklin - -	5,452,300.00	6,548,694.00
Berkshire - -	6,744,648.34	9,546,926.76
Norfolk - - -	10,229,311.09	15,522,527.00
Bristol - - -	11,346,916.33	19,493,685.84
Plymouth - -	7,576,932.06	10,964,719.00
Barnstable - -	3,500,000.00	4,896,683.00
Dukes - - -	534,166.75	1,107,344.00
Nantucket - -	3,895,288.40	6,074,374.00
	<u>208,360,407.54</u>	<u>299,878,329.60</u>

This table shows an increase of \$91,517,922 in ten years. At the same ratio of increase upon the larger capital to begin with in 1841, the accumulation of property in Massachusetts, since that period, will amount to about \$100,000,000, calling it eight years. And the total value of property in this State, at this moderate estimate, would be \$400,000,000, which is near twice that of Maryland, including the value of the slaves.

But the fact is well known that Massachusetts has increased in wealth in a much greater ratio since 1841 than at any previous period. In 1842, the Great Western Railroad was opened, from Boston to Albany, which has given to the former place a large share in the trade of the Western States, and makes it the second commercial city in the Union. Numerous other roads have been built, which facilitate commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural operations, in a far higher degree than was enjoyed at the period of the last assessment. The fact is also well known, that the amount of manufactures has greatly increased, and added millions to the wealth of the State. These considerations warrant us in taking as reasonable the estimate of \$450,000,000 for the value of property in Massachusetts at this time. This estimate is not mine, but emanates from Boston, and went the rounds of the newspapers a month or two since. I think it is well grounded. In 1831, the value of property in Boston was \$80,244,261; in 1841, it was \$110,000,000—showing an increase, in ten years, of \$30,000,000. But in the seven years subsequent to 1841, the accumulation amounted to \$57,000,000, as before stated. This fact shows that the ratio of accumulation had doubled in the latter period. Now, if it has only been fifty per cent. greater in the State at large, then \$450,000,000 will fall short of the true value of property.

Massachusetts has bank stock to the value of \$33,000,000, which is more than the total value of real and personal estate in South Carolina, exclusive of slaves—that is to say, more than the accumulated labor of that State; yet South Carolina is four times as large as Massachusetts. Massachusetts has railroads to the value of \$46,777,000, the gross earnings of which exceed \$6,000,000, and the net earnings \$2,716,000. Her savings institutions have deposits to the value of nearly \$12,000,000, and her insurance offices have a capital of \$5,825,500. This shows an aggregate of corporation property, exclusive of manufactures, to the value of above \$97,000,000—a sum which exceeds the value of the real estate of any Southern State, except Virginia and Kentucky. It exceeds the total value of North and South Carolina, exclusive of slaves. I have stated the value of property in Maryland at \$189,000,000, exclusive of the value of slaves to the owners, but which are worth less to the State than so many free men. I have not seen a statement of the bank capital of the State, but it is fair to presume that it is proportioned to the capital invested in trade and commerce. The amount invested in the foreign trade in 1843 was only \$4,414,000, and in the retail trade \$9,246,170. The value of railroads in Maryland is perhaps \$10,000,000, and the Chesapeake and Ohio canal has cost some twelve or thirteen millions of dollars. It is to be remarked, that much of the road to Cumberland lies in Virginia. The net receipts of the Maryland roads is only about \$800,000, against \$2,700,000 in Massachusetts; while the Chesapeake and Ohio canal has not paid expenses. These improvements, by the way, lie almost wholly in the northern and western counties, where there are few slaves, and where the number is daily diminishing. In consequence of this circumstance, the Maryland improvements will prove finally successful.

In April, 1845, the amount of capital invested in Massachusetts, in the various branches of manufactures, amounted to \$59,145,767, and the value of articles manufactured in the preceding year was \$114,478,443. This includes the raw material, the value of which I have no means of estimating with accuracy. I have before me a volume of statistics compiled by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, (Mr. Palfrey,) and published by authority of the Government, which I make use of. I find that 56,901,954 pounds of cotton were manufactured into 175,682,919 yards of cloth, besides cotton yarn, thread, batting, and wadding, to the value of more than \$700,000. At this rate, supposing the whole to have been made into cloth, we should have at least four yards to the

pound. The cloth would perhaps average fifteen cents per yard, or sixty cents of manufactured value to the pound of raw material, worth, say, ten cents. The raw material would, therefore, cost one-sixth of the value. But for all articles I am willing to say the fourth, and then the value of the manufactures of Massachusetts—the value created by her labor and capital, exclusive of commerce, trade, transportation, and agriculture—will be, in round numbers, \$85,800,000! This is about fifty per cent. more than the cotton crop of the United States amounts to.

The production of grain in Massachusetts has always been inconsiderable, in consequence of her sterile soil and cold climate. The value of her manufacture of shoes is twice the value of grain produced; and if there was a decline from 1840 to 1845 in the grain product, it was because her citizens found more lucrative employment. The probability is, that, owing to the growth of towns, more attention was given to gardening than before, to the neglect of agriculture; or 1845 may have been a short crop.

"The States of New York and Virginia," says Mr. Fisher, "are both of great territorial extent, and not materially unequal in that respect." I will settle the precise state of this question before proceeding to speak of the wealth and prosperity of the two States. According to Darby's Gazetteer, as quoted above, the area of Virginia is 70,000 square miles, and that of New York 46,000. In regard to Virginia, Mr. Darby remarks that "The area of this State is usually underrated; as, by a careful measurement of the rhombs, the superficies are within a fraction of 70,000 square miles." Of New York, he says that it "contains 45,085 square miles, including lakes and islands." It will be remembered that New York contains numerous lakes entirely within its frontiers, besides being bounded by Lakes Erie, Ontario, and Champlain. The line of the State passes through the middle of these lakes, and if their waters are included in the above area, a deduction of some thousand square miles must be made from the land surface, as above stated. But, supposing the remark of Mr. Darby to be confined to the small lakes wholly within the State, still a deduction must be made from the 46,085 square miles. Virginia has no lakes, and no water, except a small portion of the Chesapeake Bay. I will, however, take the two States at the extent stated, and Virginia will have the advantage by 24,000 square miles. That is to say, Virginia exceeds New York in size by an area greater than the half of the latter. This is what Mr. Fisher calls not being "materially unequal" in extent of territory. To make New York equal in territory to Virginia, we should have to add the contiguous States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont. And, if slavery is willing to make a fair comparison with freedom, we should add the wealth of these New England States to that of New York. They were one and all of them settled at a later period than Virginia, and enjoyed not a tithe of her natural advantages. Their chief happiness consisted in being too sterile or too cold to foster the institution of slavery, and this single circumstance has given them their present vast superiority over Virginia and the whole South, in wealth, in education, and in civilization.

But I have no wish to appear as begging the question. I take issue with Mr. Fisher upon the comparative wealth of Virginia and New York, though the latter contains less than two-thirds the area of the former. Mr. Fisher continues:

"New York is also regarded habitually as one of the grandest products of free institutions, and the present condition of Virginia is continually referred to, as a striking and melancholy result of slavery. Her poverty, her ignorance, her idleness, her decay, and her misery, are the threadbare topics of modern political philosophy, here and abroad. Let us now consider the facts. Her free population in 1840, according to the census, was 790,810, and her property is now about \$600,000,000." So says Mr. Fisher. In a note to this place, in the pamphlet of Mr. F., he remarks: "The property of Massachusetts is stated according to recent estimates in her papers." This is untrue. I have shown that her last assessment was made in 1841. He says, in the same note, "that (the value of property) of Virginia was computed at the amount now assumed in 1834 by Professor Dew. I have seen no official statement."

Mr. Fisher's calculations, then, are not based on "official statements," but on assumptions of "Professor Dew." Now, this Professor Dew wrote a pamphlet in defence of slavery, in the year 1832, and when he made this "assumption" he had reference very possibly to the same pious purpose. Then a boy, I remember to have been shocked and disgusted with his essay to prove the divine origin of the institution. But this circumstance is not to be taken as proof of the falsity of his "assumption;" I will analyze and compare it with the official statements which Mr. Fisher "had not seen."

I have already stated the great superiority of Virginia over New York in extent of territory. She enjoys other natural advantages in a higher degree. Her climate is milder, and her soil as good as that of New York; and while the latter State has but one navigable stream uniting the sea shore with the interior, Virginia has several. There is the Chesapeake bay, which extends to the frontiers of Pennsylvania, traversing in its course the State of Maryland; there are the Potomac, the Rappahannock, the York, and the James, which have their outlet to the sea through Virginia, to say nothing of the rivers of North Carolina which are united with Norfolk by the Dismal Swamp canal. It requires a powerful counteracting cause to cripple and destroy these natural facilities for commerce. I must add, that the harbors of Norfolk and Portsmouth are not a whit behind that of New York. But, with all these circumstances favorable to commerce, Norfolk is a village. Another great advantage of Virginia consists in the adaptation of her soil to produce tobacco, an article which has always commanded two or three prices, if we compare it with common agricultural products, such as grain and vegetables.

Virginia was the first of the colonies settled by Europeans, and at the period of the formation of the Constitution was nearly twice as populous as any of the States north or south of it. In 1790, it contained 748,308 inhabitants, while New York contained only 340,120. Yet for some cause, which Mr. Fisher's philosophy will not explain, the relative situations of these States has been entirely changed. In 1840, Virginia contained only 1,239,797 inhabitants, while the population of New York was 2,482,921. This fact is *prima facie* evidence of wealth and prosperity on the one hand, and of poverty and destitution on the other. We will now examine how far "official statements" will sustain this foregone conclusion.

I have taken some pains to ascertain the value of the property of Virginia, and have not relied upon the assumptions of either Mr. Fisher or Professor Dew. For this purpose I have examined the legislative documents of Virginia, and find, in that of 1838, a statement of the assessed value of real estate, according to the assessment of 1819; I think the return was made in 1820. A reassessment took place in 1839, twenty years later, a statement of which may be found in the legislative journals for the session of 1839-'40.

Aggregate value of lands and lots, including houses and fixtures of every description, in 1819, arranged by districts.

1. District from seaboard to head of tide-water	-	-	\$71,496,997
2. District from tide-water to Blue Ridge	-	-	78,165,919
3. District between Blue Ridge and Alleghany	-	-	41,173,512
4. District west of Alleghany	-	-	16,057,550
Total	-	-	<u>\$206,893,978</u>

Aggregate value of lands and lots, including houses and fixtures of all kinds, in 1839, arranged by districts.

1. District from seaboard to head of tide-water	-	-	\$60,704,053
2. District from tide-water to Blue Ridge	-	-	69,016,706
3. District between Blue Ridge and Alleghany	-	-	42,992,204
4. District west of Alleghany	-	-	39,217,545
Total	-	-	<u>\$211,930,508</u>

These "official statements" give but indifferent countenance to Professor Dew's "assumption" that the value of property in Virginia amounted to \$600,000,000. In any community, but more especially an agricultural one, real estate comprises the great bulk of property. Even Mr. Fisher's genius could not scrape together more than a few millions, by way of addition to these official statements, exclusive of the value of slaves. There is very little personal property in the Southern States, except slaves.

But, before going into these particulars, I will point the reader's attention to the remarkable fact, that while there is an aggregate increase in the value of real estate in Virginia, in the twenty years which intervened between the two assessments, yet, in East Virginia, where the bulk of the slaves are, there was a great diminution. Thus, below tide-water, in 1819, the value of real property was \$71,496,997, but in 1839 it amounted to only \$60,704,053, showing a depreciation to the value of \$10,792,944. Between tide-water and the Blue Ridge, the great tobacco country of Virginia, the depreciation was almost as great. In 1819, the value of real estate in this district was \$78,165,919; while, in 1839 it was only \$69,016,705, showing a diminution of \$9,149,214. The aggregate loss of the eastern districts was \$10,942,178 in the value of real estate! But this is not all. The population of Richmond, Petersburg, and Norfolk, made a considerable advance between the two assessments, and their property doubtless increased in a still greater ratio. In 1820, the population of the three places was 27,235; in 1840, it amounted to 42,209. If we add Portsmouth and Lynchburg, places which have sprung up within the period in question, we may assume that the population and property of the towns were enhanced seventy-five or a hundred per cent. If, therefore, we subtract the value of town lots from the aggregate value of real estate in East Virginia, at the two periods, it will show a still greater diminution of the value of lands, houses, and fixtures, in the country. In 1819 the aggregate value of property was greater, and the value of town lots less, than in 1839. We should have to subtract, say, \$10,000,000 from \$149,662,916; while at the second we should take, say, \$20,000,000 from \$129,720,759. I have not taken the pains to ascertain the improvement in the value of town lots in Eastern Virginia, in the twenty years under consideration, but have little hesitation in saying that it is fully fifty per cent.; and these values deducted from the aggregate values, will show an amazing depreciation in country property.

This contrast in the respective conditions of town and country is well calculated to excite surprise, and baffle calculation, in the minds of persons who are unfamiliar with or inattentive to the effects of Slavery upon the body politic. The same process is at work in my native State, North Carolina; the country is depopulating, or changing into a wilderness, by the removal of the slaves to the Southwest, while the towns are improving. The reason, though not obvious, is clear. The free population is gaining on the slave—the proportion of freemen is increasing, that of the slaves is diminishing. Slavery can only be maintained by the most lucrative agriculture; and the wants of slaves are so few and simple, that they give no encouragement to the arts of life. In a community where all are lordly slaveholders and beggarly slaves, there is nothing to give employment to trades-people. The slaveholders are frequently themselves their own importers and exporters; if not from foreign countries, at least from the seaport town where their products are exported. Accordingly, we find that there are no villages in the districts where Slavery is the predominant interest. Many of the court houses in the oldest counties of Virginia and the Carolinas are distinguished on the maps by the letters "C. H.," there being no village or hamlet to give it a name. As the slaves are removed, their places are gradually and noiselessly taken by the poor whites, whose emigrating tendencies are thereby checked in an equal ratio. Frequently a planter, instead of removing, sends off his slaves to the South and sells them; in such case the capital, which before was dead and unproductive, becomes an active agent in improving the condition of the country. It is generally the case that those who dispose of their slaves are forced to it from necessity, in order to pay their debts. Still, the metempsychosis which the capital undergoes is advantageous, although it may, in the pro-

cess, change hands. Slavery is a sponge which absorbs capital, and diverts it from useful investments; and the community is always the gainer by getting rid of it in whole or in part. Even if it is carried away, and nothing brought back in return, yet the community is benefited, since it makes a void to be filled by free labor; and future accumulations can no more be swallowed up by it.

The persons for whose benefit the slaves are sold to the South are generally the merchants and moneyed men; and these classes, in one way or another, give more encouragement to free labor than the slaveholders. They build better houses, live in the villages and towns, and thus make a market for what the poor man produces—as vegetables, butter, milk, poultry, and the like. In this way freedom is slowly and quietly asserting its power to reclaim the wilderness which slavery has made. The plantations have been impoverished and deserted. The towns are beginning to rise upon their ruins, and to form around them a nucleus of improved agriculture, as well as of arts and civilization.

I must in this place call the reader's attention to the theory by which Mr. Fisher attempts to show that the decline of Southern commerce and manufactures has been more than compensated by her flourishing and prosperous agriculture. He says: "The North, and even many in the South, have assumed a decline in manufactures and commerce, to be a decline of general prosperity. This is an error. The policy of the Federal Government, and the domestic institutions of the Southern States, have indeed been unfavorable to the latter in those pursuits; but the agriculture of the South has maintained and advanced in prosperity beyond that of any other people." In another place he says: "The triumph of Southern enterprise and capital in the accumulation of wealth being established as a fact, demands of us an investigation of its causes," &c.

No comment is necessary upon these ridiculous assumptions, further than to point the reader to the fact that the real estate in Virginia has been depreciating for thirty years, if not longer, while all the free States, as well as those parts of Virginia where there are few slaves, have doubled or trebled in value in the same period. I have shown, in a preceding portion of this essay, that Southern commerce and manufactures have not declined; but that, poor and meager as they ever have been, they are improving. I have also shown that the Southern towns are improving slowly, while the country is becoming depopulated. This is particularly true in Virginia and Maryland, where slavery has been longest planted. I will add here, that South Carolina, where slavery is the chief and only interest, is the poorest State in the Union. Her 16,000,000 acres of land were assessed, in 1847, at only \$10,160,204! Her town lots were valued at \$17,594,175, and her goods, or personal property, at \$4,453,834; total \$32,168,213. This is the total of accumulated wealth in the State of South Carolina; the State which enjoys the blessings of slavery in a higher degree than any other. Her whole real and personal estate is less than the bank capital of Massachusetts; it is one-third less than her railroad stock; and is about one-half of the amount of her capital invested in manufactures. Boston is worth more than five times as much as South Carolina. The county of Middlesex, in Massachusetts, was worth more in 1841, and, with the accumulations since, Essex and Worcester have surpassed her!

But again: it will be remarked that the value of town property in South Carolina is nearly twice as great as that of the country—a circumstance which shows how utterly futile and ridiculous are the theories of Mr. Fisher. I should add to the \$32,168,213, the value of live stock, which were not assessed, and for that reason I was about to overlook. As to the slaves, I have shown that they are far less valuable to the State than educated free laborers, and are no part of the accumulated wealth of the country. Slavery is a local municipal regulation, which makes an unequal distribution of the public income, without adding to the amount. As to the live stock, I find, by the census of 1840, that South Carolina had 130,926 horses and mules; 573,840 neat cattle; 232,664 sheep; 898,513 hogs; and poultry to the value of \$590,594—the aggregate value of this property, supposing horses to be worth \$25, cattle \$6, and

hogs and sheep \$1.50, would be about \$9,500,000; which, added to the other values, gives \$41,168,213. This exceeds the bank capital of Massachusetts, but is less than her railroad stock.

But I have made a digression from the main point under consideration, which is the comparative wealth of Virginia and New York.

In 1840, the number of slaves in Virginia was 448,987. Of this number, 395,250 were in East Virginia, between the Blue Ridge and the sea shore. This portion of the State comprises the first and second districts, which, as the abstracts of the assessment returns above show, depreciated in the value of real estate, \$19,942,178 in twenty years. The two districts, the third and fourth, west of the Ridge, contained, in 1840, only 53,737 slaves, and the enhancement of real estate was \$25,000,000! It thus appears, that whatever Virginia gained in the twenty years, she owes to freedom, in spite of the counteracting influences of slavery—that slavery would have dragged her down to the depths of humiliation and ruin, had not the free spirit of the West pulled in the contrary direction.

But the curse of slavery has been felt in the country west of the Blue Ridge. Of the two districts which comprise West Virginia, the portion between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghany contained nearly four-fifths of the slaves. The counties upon the Ohio river, west of the last-named range, contained only about 11,000, and the Valley, as it is called, about 41,000 slaves. This fact is a key to the relative growth of the two sections. The increase in the property of the western counties was nearly 250 per cent., while the valley was nearly stationary in that respect, the rate of increase being not more than 2½ per cent. In like manner I might show that even the country west of the Alleghany range of mountains in Virginia, where the slaves constitute less than a tenth of the population, has suffered from the presence of the institution. This becomes evident, if we compare it with an equal and contiguous portion of Pennsylvania, west of the same mountain range. Pittsburg, including its environs, Alleghany and Birmingham, surpasses in population and wealth any three towns in old or new Virginia. Yet, when Eastern Virginia had been settled more than one hundred and forty years, it was a great achievement for General Washington, then a youth, to penetrate the savage wilderness to this place, then called Fort Du Quesne, and owned by the French as a trading station. The country around it, even within the memory of man, was as wild and savage as the frontiers of Iowa are at this day.

I have shown that the value of real estate in Virginia in 1839 was \$211,930,508, and that this sum exceeds the valuation which was made twenty years before by only about \$5,000,000. The abstracts of the two assessments which I have given above, show that this aggregate gain belongs entirely to the counties west of the Blue Ridge, and would have been five times as great had Eastern Virginia have barely maintained her ground. I have also stated, what is apparent from the tables, that Eastern Virginia depreciated in the value of real estate, the amount of \$19,942,178 in the same period. Now, a schoolboy, who understands the Rule of Three, could make it pretty clear to a plain man of sense, that if East Virginia loses twenty millions in twenty years in the depreciation of real estate, she must lose ten millions more, or thereabouts, in the ten years since 1839. The same state of things exists: nothing has occurred to arrest this process of decline—this galloping consumption. At no period has the process of depopulation gone on more rapidly. The country is deserted, and yet the towns are improving. It may be assumed, therefore, that the present value of real estate in East Virginia is ten millions less than it was in 1839, and thirty millions less than in 1819, while, by the same mode of computation, the aggregate value of real estate in the whole State is about two and a half millions more than in 1839. I will give the State the benefit of this addition to her wealth, but it must never be lost sight of that the gain belongs to freedom in the western half of the State. The present value of real property thus arrived at is, therefore, about \$214,400,000. I will now attempt to give the reader a notion of the value of personal property.

I will place the same value upon live stock at which that of South Carolina was rated above. Considering that the domestic animals of all ages and sizes

are included, I think that the prices fixed upon are sufficiently high. I take the number of horses from the American Almanac for 1849, which sets forth the taxable property of Virginia for the year 1847. The other live stock are not given; and I resort to the census of 1840, when the number was not materially different from what it now is. At the prices named, this species of property amounts to about \$18,744,000. I have seen a statement in a report made by a committee of the Commercial Convention at Norfolk in 1838, that the capital invested in goods purchased at the North by retailers was \$38,736,000 the preceding year, and that there were fifty-seven wholesale merchants, whose capital equalled one hundred thousand dollars each. But this would include fixtures, perhaps. I will, however, set down their trading capital at \$5,000,000, making in all about \$43,000,000 invested in mercantile operations in every shape. To cover such items as have not been enumerated, I will add seven millions more. These sums, together, make up an amount of nearly \$68,500,000 of personal property, which, added to the real, shows an aggregate value of property in Virginia of nearly \$283,000,000. Now, even on Mr. Fisher's principles of including the value of the slaves, he cannot make out more than \$400,000,000. There were, in 1840, 448,000 slaves. Call the number 450,000, and multiply by the average price of \$250, and the amount is \$112,500,000. Add this sum to the value of real and personal property, as above stated, and they amount to \$395,000,000. This is all Mr. Fisher can claim, if he pays any regard to official documents. It will be remembered that I have shown that Massachusetts cannot at present be worth less than \$450,000,000, while Virginia, with an area at least *eight* times as large—an older, more fertile State, with greater natural facilities for commerce and manufactures—is worth only \$283,000,000! So much for the triumphs of Southern enterprise.

I will now turn to New York. I can do Mr. Fisher the justice to say, that he has been unusually accurate in his statements in regard to this State. I learn from the American Almanac that there were, in 1847, 27,880,467 acres of land, valued at \$509,496,855, and that the personal property of the State was assessed at \$121,162,201. These sums, added together, make about \$631,659,000; but the corrected aggregate valuation, says the Almanac, is \$632,699,993. The assessment in New York is annual, and for that reason is perhaps less thorough than in Virginia, where they take place only after the lapse of long periods. There is something incredible in the statement that the value of personal estate in the State of New York is only \$121,162,201; and it is equally difficult to believe that the personal estate in the city is but \$59,837,917. The value of goods imported into that city in the year 1848 was \$94,525,121, and it is fair to assume that an amount of foreign goods are always on hand equal to that sum. Then there must be domestic fabrics and agricultural products on hand to the value of as many millions, perhaps, to say nothing of the household furniture in a rich community of 400,000 people. The number of carriages, public and private, including hacks, omnibuses, &c., with the horses that draw them, the thousands of drays and dray horses, must amount to millions. The \$94,525,121 worth of imports are of course in the hands of the importers or wholesale merchants; and then it will require millions to fill the shops of the retailers. There can be no doubt that the retail business in the city of New York is greater than that of Virginia.

It is notorious that, besides the city of New York, the State contains hundreds of towns, cities, and villages, numbering from one thousand to one hundred thousand inhabitants. These towns are built in splendid style, of brick or wood, and contain stores filled with goods. Their aggregate value cannot be less than the sum set down as the total value of personal property in the State. I find the following statement of the value of property in twelve cities and towns in the State of New York in the American Quarterly Register:

	Valuation.
Albany - - - - -	\$11,387,736
Brooklyn - - - - -	29,565,189
Buffalo - - - - -	8,497,152
Brunswick - - - - -	755,160
Flushing - - - - -	2,393,135
Hudson - - - - -	1,150,550
Newtown - - - - -	1,989,175
New York - - - - -	247,152,303
Poughkeepsie - - - - -	3,499,197
Rochester - - - - -	4,634,681
Utica - - - - -	3,480,766
Williamsburg - - - - -	3,125,162
Total - - - - -	<u>\$317,538,840</u>

The total value of property in these twelve towns and cities, as is apparent, is greater than that of the State of Virginia! And yet there is strong reason to suspect that the valuation is in many cases less than half the proper amount. Albany, for instance, with a population in 1845 of 41,139, and which now cannot be less than 50,000, is valued at \$11,387,736, while Richmond, in Virginia, in 1838, when the population was less than 20,000, was assessed at \$10,640,884 for *real estate* alone; and if the personal estate were added, the sum would be swelled to the amount of some millions more. These facts show, incontrovertibly, that the assessment of Albany is three or four times too low, or that of Richmond as many times too high. Richmond is one of the most thriving towns in the Southern country, and yet it is less prosperous by far than Albany, as is indicated by the census tables, and has little more than half the population. In 1840, the population of Richmond was 20,153, that of Albany 35,721; yet, in 1838, the *real estate* of Richmond was valued at nearly as much as real and personal estate in Albany in 1847. There is far more business at the capital of New York than at that of Virginia—the former being at the eastern terminus of the greatest canal in Christendom, with a railroad parallel to it, while the latter, though naturally well situated, has no such advantage as the outlet of Western trade. It is utterly incredible, therefore, that Richmond, in 1838, could have been worth more, or one-third part as much as Albany in 1847. The people of New York, being relieved from the pressure of public debt, have placed a low value on property, while Virginia, finding it a difficult matter to provide the means of paying the interest of her debt, has made the assessment at the true value.

Washington city, being in the same situation with Virginia, has likewise placed the full value upon property in the assessment, or something approaching to it. By the last assessment, the real and personal estate of Washington, exclusive of Government property, which is not taxed, was valued at about \$12,000,000; and yet it is notoriously one of the poorest places in America.

Buffalo, one of the most thriving and prosperous places in the world, certainly superior in these respects to any Southern town except St. Louis, was assessed in 1847 at only \$8,497,152, when the population was not less than 35,000; in 1845 it was 29,773, showing a gain of 11,500 in five years. Rochester, with about the same population and equal prosperity, was assessed at only \$4,634,681. Salem, in Massachusetts, with only half the population, and less thriving, has been assessed—I know not the date, it may be in 1841, or 1847—at above \$10,000,000. Providence, in Rhode Island, with less population than Buffalo or Rochester, has been assessed at about \$28,500,000! These comparisons with Northern and Southern cities put the question beyond doubt, that the people of New York have a conventional agreement to assess property at one-half or one-third its true value, for the reason that they are not burdened with taxes, as some other States are.

But, notwithstanding these evident marks of undervaluation, New York has an assessed value of considerably more than twice that of Virginia, though her population is not quite double in amount. I have shown that the total

real and personal estate of Virginia is \$283,000,000; that of New York, as assessed, is \$632,000,000. The assessments of real property, and the estimates of personal made by myself, are fully up to the true value of Virginia; but, for the reasons stated above, I am induced to believe that the value of property in New York is at least double the assessed value.

I will briefly notice what Mr. Fisher says of the States of Kentucky and Ohio. He says: "In 1840, Kentucky had a free population of 597,370, and her property amounts, according to her tax assessment of 1848, to about \$272,847,696. Ohio in 1840 had a population of 1,519,467, and her assessment last year was \$421,067,991. The average value of property belonging to each free person in Kentucky is \$456—in Ohio, it is only \$276, or more than one-third less." I have to take Mr. Fisher's authority for these statements, having no access to the official documents of either State later than 1842 or 1843. In the latter year, the slaves of Kentucky were valued at \$45,831,175. The number of slaves is now some thousands greater than at that time, and are worth as much. Taking this sum from the value of property in the State as above stated, viz: \$272,847,696, and there remains \$227,016,521 for the true value of property in Kentucky—a sum little more than half that of Ohio, and in like proportions to their respective populations. But it must be borne in mind that Kentucky is as large as Ohio, and was settled twenty years earlier. Kentucky became a State at a time when Ohio was yet a wilderness. If the population of Ohio were scattered over a territory as large in proportion to its numbers as the State of Kentucky is to its inhabitants, the value of real estate, even if it were less improved, would be augmented by the additional number of acres. Or, to reverse the comparison, if the population of Kentucky occupied a territory no larger in proportion to its numbers than that of Ohio, a deduction of something like a third or a fourth would have to be made from the value of real estate. Nor is this all. Kentucky and Ohio are extensively engaged in breeding horses, cattle, and hogs, for the Southern and Eastern markets. Now, it is obvious that the Kentuckian has twice as much land for his stock to graze upon, as is enjoyed by the citizen of Ohio; so that one man in the former State may in this branch of business do the business of two in Ohio. If Ohio had as much land to the number of inhabitants as Kentucky, it might raise twice the amount of stock.

Mr. Fisher's generalizations are as puerile and contradictory as his facts are false and unfounded. It will be remembered that I have combated at some length his assertion, that the cities of the South "monopolized our colonial commerce, and maintained their ascendancy in the earlier years of the Union." Although I think my own refutation of this assertion most satisfactory, because resting on official statistics, still I might have saved myself the labor, had I known that Mr. Fisher himself has given his sanction to a statement which overthrows it *in toto*. I find the following extract from Bancroft's History of the United States in Mr. Fisher's published Lecture, which he quotes with entire approbation:

"But the greatest safeguard of liberty in Virginia was the individual freedom of mind, which formed, of necessity, the character of independent landholders, living apart on their plantations. In the age of commercial monopoly, Virginia had not one market-town—not one place of trade. As to all outward appearance, it looked like a wild desert; and the mercantile world, founding its judgment on the absence of cities, regarded it as 'one of the poorest, miserablest, and worst countries in America.' It did not seek to share actively in the profits of commerce; it had little of the precious metals, and still less of credit; it was satisfied with agriculture. Taxes were paid in tobacco; remittances to Europe were made in tobacco; the revenue of the clergy, and the magistrates, and the colony, was collected in the same currency; the colonial tradesman received his pay in straggling parcels of it, and ships from abroad were obliged to be whole months in the rivers, before boats, visiting the several plantations on their banks, could pick up a cargo. In the season of a commercial revolution, the commercial element did not enter into the character of the colony. Its inhabitants 'daily grew more and more averse to cohabitation.'"

Mr. Fisher sanctions this sweeping refutation of his own assertions as follows:

"Such was the character of Virginia in 1700—ninety-two years after the colony was founded, and seventy-six before her independence; such she has remained. I have seen a law, passed by her Legislature during the Revolutionary war, prohibiting merchants from serving as Representatives in the Continental Congress."

Nothing which I can add can make the ridiculous inconsistency more apparent.

Mr. Fisher remarks, "it has been through negro slavery that agriculture has been made, for the first time in the history of the world, so profitable and attractive as to render rural life the favorite of wealth as well as of the mass of the people." If negro slavery has this miraculous virtue, why did it perish in the Northern States? It was not because the people there had originally any more repugnance to it than those at the South. It was simply, as every one knows, that slaves were unprofitable. The same cause is now driving slavery out of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas—it has become unprofitable and burdensome to the people. The same cause put an end to villanage in England, and to slavery in every country in Europe. So far from slavery rendering agriculture profitable, it can only be sustained by the most lucrative species of agriculture; as the production of cotton, tobacco, sugar, and rice—articles which cannot be grown where the great bulk of mankind reside, with whom we have intercourse. They are monopoly articles, and command a monopoly price. Nothing else could keep life in the system of slavery.

Mr. Fisher would convince the Southern people that they are the richest in the world, at the moment that their newspapers are imploring Northern capitalists to build them railroads, or set up manufactories in their midst. They are immensely rich, according to Mr. Fisher, and yet they have neither commerce nor manufactures, and their agriculture is so bad, that instead of improving the land, it is invariably worn out in a few years, if upland, and the owner compelled to abandon it. The press of the South presents the most glowing pictures of the facilities of manufacturing—the water power, and the abundance of coal, all of which lie neglected, because the inveterate prejudice of the Yankee will not see them, and improve them. Now, why is not Mr. Fisher's superabundance of Southern capital invested in this way? Charleston is the only place between Baltimore and New Orleans which has any pretensions to the name of a city. It has a fine harbor and a railroad extending far into the interior, and yet the population is declining. Railroads cause the city and country to flourish in the free States, but where slavery exists, it would seem that their effect is to facilitate the process of depopulation. In 1840, the population of Charleston was 29,461, which was one thousand less than in 1830. Last year the census was re-taken by the city authorities; and the population had fallen to twenty-six thousand some hundreds. What makes the matter worse, according to Mr. Fisher's economy, is the fact that the slaves have been removed, while the whites have either increased or remained stationary. Here, then, is a less amount of property to divide among a greater number of "citizens." Nothing, on his principles, is so ruinous to the wealth of a community as the increase in the number of the citizen class. Now, if the process had been reversed—if the poor whites had been driven out by force of law or by force of circumstances, while the slaves were retained—this process of depopulation, which lessens the citizen class and increases the slaves, would greatly augment the *per capita* amount of wealth. If this operation should go so far as to banish all white men from the State who are ineligible to a seat in the Legislature—that is to say, the owners of ten negroes, or five hundred pounds of income—South Carolina would present the anomaly of a nation of nabobs. There would be, perhaps, a free population of some ten thousand, to divide all the land and negroes of the State. Should this policy be adopted and strictly carried out, the State of South Carolina would be second only to Turkey in the individual wealth of its "citizens." The Ottoman Empire will still bear off the palm from the economists of Mr. Fisher's school, because the Grand Turk has no fellow-citizens; he stands "solitary and alone," as the great citizen, owning millions of square miles of arid deserts and wasted fields, peopled by millions of degraded beings who are his slaves or tributaries.

Mr. Fisher argues that there must be more individual wealth among the "citizens" of Virginia, and a wider diffusion of it, from the fact that two-thirds of the adult males are either landholders, leaseholders, or housekeepers.

This fact he ascertains from the number of votes cast in the State, in comparison with the number of adult males. Now, this is, as I suppose, about the proportion of landholders, leaseholders, and housekeepers, in any community. Can Mr. Fisher show the contrary? But the fact is immaterial. What we are concerned to know, is, not the number of housekeepers, but their condition; and, unfortunately, we know that the poor whites in the slave region of Virginia, and generally through the South, are among the poorest people in the world. It is commonly said, and I believe it is true, that the poor whites in the slave districts fare worse than the slaves. This is because all the capital is invested in slaves, and nothing remains to give employment to free labor. The poor whites are too poor to till the ground, of which there is abundance, for want of capital to begin with. And, besides, there is no market in the slave States for such articles as can be produced with advantage by poor families—as vegetables, eggs, poultry, &c.

The robust health of the citizens of the free States, without regard to the locality, arises from habits of labor, with the comforts which labor brings them. On the contrary, the poorest classes in the slave districts of the South have a puny, sickly appearance, chiefly for the opposite reason. The negroes are universally healthy and strong, where they are well fed and clothed.

There is, in the South, a prejudice against the employment of free labor in the fields, beside of the slaves; and this circumstance, combined with the fact above adverted to, that the capital is tied up in the system of slavery, accounts for the squalid poverty of the poor whites in the slave districts.

Mr. Fisher states that there are 50,000 pleasure carriages in Ohio, against 19,000 in Virginia; and then, to make out his case of the superior wealth of the latter, he assumes that the free population of Ohio is three times that of Virginia. He, of course, has no idea that a slave could indulge in the presumptuous wish of taking a ride, and therefore makes no provision for them. He might with greater propriety have excluded the poor whites, say three-fourths of the white population, because every Southern man knows that the slaves ride in their masters' carriages in the capacity of drivers and servants, and take infinite pride and pleasure in it; whereas, the poor whites never in their lives enjoy such an honor. It is, therefore, proper to include the slaves, or to leave out the poor whites; and to do both would be more rational than the course pursued by Mr. Fisher. In estimating the degree of comfort and luxury enjoyed by a community, compared with that of other communities, it is proper that the whole populations should be taken into the account; and I shall, therefore, include the slaves and poor whites.

Ohio had last year about one million eight to nine hundred thousand inhabitants; and 50,000 carriages would be 1 to 36 or 37 persons. Virginia contained about twelve hundred and fifty to seventy thousand inhabitants; and 19,000 carriages would be 1 to 66 or 67 persons—showing that Ohio enjoys the comfort or luxury of riding in carriages in nearly twice the proportion of the people of Virginia.

Mr. Fisher makes some statements relative to the number of houses built in the Northern States, on the authority of the census tables. I have not examined those tables, and therefore cannot say how far he is correct. It would be a great affectation of courtesy to say that I receive them from his hands as accurate, after the experience I have had. But, for once, I will take for granted the truth of his figures. He compares Massachusetts with Virginia, a State only *eight times* as large; and the result is, that, in 1840, the former built 324 brick houses, the latter 402. It will be remembered that *every* part of Massachusetts has been settled as densely as *any* part of Virginia, for more than a century. Yet the former built nearly as many houses in 1840, on one-eighth the territory, as the latter. "Massachusetts," says Mr. Fisher, "built 1,249 wooden houses the same year, Virginia 2,604, or more than double. The cost of the houses in Massachusetts was \$2,767,134, in Virginia only \$1,367,393, or about half." The redoubtable Mr. Fisher is no less proud of this *superiority* in the value of buildings in Virginia, than I have shown him to be of the superiority of the numbers. He infers from it, that many of the Massachusetts houses are large factories or stately palaces, which would leave

a smaller proportion of farm houses. But, unfortunately for Mr. Fisher's theory, the number of houses in Massachusetts is to the number in Virginia in very nearly the ratio of their populations. Mr. Fisher has not told us, either, what proportion of the Virginia houses are log huts, for negro dwellings or tobacco barns.

He next compares Virginia and Ohio. "In 1840," he remarks, "Ohio built 970 brick, and 2,764 wooden houses, at a cost of \$3,776,823. Thus, while we (Ohio) had twice the white population, we built only a fourth more houses." So reasons Mr. Fisher.

I have shown, in a preceding part of this essay, that his policy leaves the negroes entirely without clothing; he acts consistently in this place in denying them a shelter from the rain and storm. It is nevertheless true, though Mr. Fisher be ignorant of the fact, that the negroes of Virginia do live in houses, (such as they are;) and it is no less true that these houses are numbered in the census tables as such. He mistakes the year, by the way; it should be 1839, because the census being taken in 1840, of course could not state the number of houses built that year. This fact is material, since the number built in Ohio is progressive with the rapidly increasing population, whereas Virginia is nearly stationary in this as in everything. In 1839, then, when the population of Virginia was more than twelve hundred thousand, and that of Ohio not more than fourteen, the value of buildings in the latter was nearly three times greater than in the former. According to Mr. F.'s own statement, Virginia built to the value of \$1,367,393, and Ohio to the value of \$3,776,823! He states, also, that Kentucky built, with forty per cent. of white population, seventy-five per cent. of the number of houses that Ohio did; but he has not told us the value of the Kentucky buildings. Kentucky had, in 1839, more than half as much population as Ohio; but if her buildings were of no better quality than those of Virginia, their value could not have been half as great. In fact, the number of houses built in Virginia was nearly as great as in Ohio; while their value was little more than one-third. The same thing is doubtless, in a great measure, true of Kentucky.

I have no ready means of examining the statements of Mr. Fisher (in regard to buildings) before me at present; but, taking him at his own word, I have shown that the North is from two to three fold more prosperous than the South.

Since writing what I had to say upon Mr. Fisher's statistics of houses, I have seen the census tables, which make the strongest possible case against his conclusions. He carefully avoided any allusion to New York or Pennsylvania on that head. He only stated what suited his purpose, and even that I have turned against him. Massachusetts, it will be remembered, was set down at \$2,767,134, against \$1,367,393 in Virginia, which is eight times as large. The value of houses built in New York, in the same year, was \$7,265,844, which is five and a half times their value in Virginia. Pennsylvania built to the value of \$5,354,480—three times more than Virginia. The reader will remember what I said of Kentucky and Ohio. I find my conclusions more than sustained. The former built to the value of \$1,039,172, while the buildings in Ohio amounted to \$3,776,823! three and a half times more. The value of ships built in Maine was greater than that of houses in any Southern State; and the value of houses in Maine nearly double that of Tennessee. South Carolina is placed ahead of all the Southern States in this particular, viz: \$1,527,576. This is evidently a mistake. The population of Charleston has been diminishing for thirty years, and stagnation and decay are visible everywhere. I find this statement in the American Almanac for 1843 or 1844. It is impossible that more houses were built in South Carolina than in Kentucky, Virginia, or Tennessee. There has been some accidental transposition of the figures in the tables.

I have taken some pains, also, to collect the statistics of horses and cattle. The Southern States, being purely agricultural, would be expected to excel in the number of these animals; but such is not the case. I present the following table, from the census returns:

	Horses and Mules.	Neat Cattle.
New York - - -	474,543	1,911,244
Virginia - - -	326,438	1,024,148
Ohio - - -	430,527	1,217,874
Kentucky - - -	395,853	787,098
Pennsylvania - - -	365,129	1,172,665
Tennessee - - -	341,409	882,851

The Northern States greatly excelled in the number of sheep; the South in the number of hogs. The fact is notorious, that Northern live stock is fifty to one hundred per cent. superior to Southern. This fact must be borne in mind in estimating their value. The North, besides monopolizing the commerce and manufactures, is very superior in agricultural productions. In making this remark, I am not overlooking the cotton and tobacco crops, which make a show because they are all exported or sent to the Northern States. In this place I will also put down some statistics of New York, confirming what I have previously said. I was not at that time in possession of them. It seems that the manufacturing capital in New York, in 1840, was \$55 000,000, and the commercial capital of the city of New York alone, was above \$60,000,000. These facts need no comment, after what I have said above.

It is a work of supererogation to refute theories founded on false facts. It is sufficient to have swept away the foundation, and the superstructure will tumble down of its own weight. I will nevertheless notice the reasoning by which Mr. Fisher feels called upon to account for the phenomenon which he supposes himself to have discovered. He says: "The reason, then, I conceive, for the great pecuniary prosperity of the South, is, that she is so generally agricultural. About half the population of the old Northern States resides in towns or cities; in the Southern, about one-tenth." He then proceeds to argue that agriculture is greatly more profitable than commerce and manufactures. The least attention to the statistics which Mr. Fisher has himself set forth, will show the utter absurdity of this notion. Massachusetts is the least agricultural State in the Union, with by far the greatest amount of manufactures, and even of commerce, to the population. Yet, according to her own official assessment, the value of property in the State, in 1840 or 1841, was \$300,000,000. Since that period, the increase of her wealth has been fully fifty per cent., making \$450,000,000. Virginia, which has very little commerce or manufactures, with eight times the territory of Massachusetts, is only worth \$283,000,000, as I have shown from official documents and fair estimates of personal chattels enumerated in the census. South Carolina I have proven on equally reliable authority to be worth only forty-one millions! Her territory is four times greater than that of Massachusetts, and yet the wealth of the latter is seven times that of South Carolina—a State where slavery has had the fairest opportunity of showing its fruits. This is a specimen of the utter recklessness of Mr. Fisher's assertions. It is a stretch of the mantle of charity to call them errors, or to suppose them arrived at by careless inquiry. And yet he has the coolness to talk of "rescuing the controversy from the control of bold assertion and slipshod declamation." I will give a specimen of his reasoning on this head—that sort of reasoning, if it may be so called, which appeals with peculiar force to the schoolboy, or to the young orator, just from college, and fresh in his classic reminiscences. He says: "Athens was overcome by Sparta—Greece by Macedon—Carthage by Rome—events which indicate the superior resources of the conquerors more than their bravery." Our good Knight signalized his courage and prowess in showing up the poverty and destitution of New York and Massachusetts, and the vastly superior wealth, power, and prosperity, of Virginia and South Carolina; but, not content with that honor, he, in the true spirit of chivalry, goes back to ancient Lacedæmon, to assure its heroic people that their black broth was far preferable to the luxuries of Athens! and that their iron coin was more current than the gold of Persia!

It was the boast of the Spartans that they were poor; and in that age, before the invention of gunpowder, or the introduction of standing armies, this circumstance was by no means so material as at present. Much more depend-

ed upon skill and courage, than upon the strength of the military chest. But Mr. Fisher overlooks this consideration, and, judging events of that age by the causes which produce similar ones now, he jumps at the conclusion, that Sparta must have had more riches than Athens. The absurdity of this conceit needs no refutation in the mind of any one who has a tincture of historical information. As to the people of Greece and Macedon, it is well known that the latter was a poor, hardy race, inhabiting a large district or country north of Greece proper; and that, in the age in which they conquered their southern neighbors, their wealth bore no comparison to that of Greece. The latter people had been corrupted by wealth and luxury, which opened the way to their conquest. Even Sparta grew comparatively wealthy, but with gold came her weakness and effeminacy. No fact is better attested in history.

Mr. Fisher and myself have not set out to moralize upon the vanity of riches. We have both assumed that wealth is desirable, and discussed the causes of its accumulation. In all ages, it is attended with evils; but it may be hoped that, under the Christian dispensation, a better disposition has been and will be made of it than in former ages. Be this as it may, we are now presupposing that wealth is desirable.

As to Rome and Carthage, Mr. Fisher cannot be ignorant that the former, even in the age of the Punic wars, was a country; while the latter was a mere city, with a territory attached not larger than the District of Columbia. Though Rome had little external commerce, the mechanic arts flourished to a considerable extent. Rome had an intimate intercourse with Greece, and received the Arts at her hands. She was in no want of the implements of war. The Roman people, too, were of a superior race to that of the Carthaginians. The European race, in all ages, have been superior to the Asiatic, in the warlike qualities of courage and fortitude. The Carthaginians were of Phœnician origin—a people who, though exhibiting great impulsive courage and fertility of resources, yielded to the iron purpose of Alexander; and so it has ever been, where the European and the Asiatic have been brought in conflict.

I have paid little attention to the statements of Mr. Fisher in regard to the relative health of different occupations, by which he expects to show that agriculture is preferable to the arts—or, rather, that the latter are undesirable, because they shorten life.

Admitting this statement to be true, it becomes a question whether man should abandon the arts, and, as a necessary consequence, become savage. There is no alternative. The simplest operations of agriculture could not be performed without the assistance of the arts. The plough, the hoe, and the axe, are all the productions of art in a highly advanced condition. Cities, commerce, manufactures, and mechanic arts, are the very essentials, as well as the exponents of civilization. If the Massachusetts statistics be correct, the conclusion they lead to is melancholy; but the case is not without remedy. Mechanics too frequently work in close rooms, surrounded by impure atmosphere; the deleterious influence is not so immediate as to awaken attention, or to call for instant remedy; the Government of Massachusetts has acted wisely in bringing the subject thus officially to the notice of the public.

But Mr. Fisher has not shown that Southern agriculture is equally bracing and healthful with that of Massachusetts. Statistics and experience would prove the contrary. It is commonly reported by Southern men, that the culture of sugar and cotton in the Southwestern States is attended with great destruction of life to the slaves; and it is computed that those who are carried there for sale from the older States die on an average in four or five years. This arises from overworking, rather than from any noxious principle in the sugar or cotton plant, or in the atmosphere. I am aware that a no less criminal and detestable custom of over-working has existed in the Northern factories. No right-minded man will apologize for either. What I have said of the over-working of the slaves I have derived either from planters or slave traders, and they but utter the common opinion. I could have indulged the hope that it was ill-founded, but for the melancholy confirmation it derives from the census tables. The over-working, besides producing death in adult

slaves, on an average, in five years, greatly diminishes the number of births; for the women, no less than the men, labor in the fields and sugar factories. In this way the hard usage has a two-fold influence in curtailing the increase of population. The strong stimulant to over-working commenced after the census of 1830, with the rise in cotton; and accordingly I find that, from 1820 to 1830, the increase of the slaves was nearly as great as in the subsequent ten years. This shows a great diminution in the *ratio* of increase. Thus, in 1820, there were 1,538,064 slaves in the United States, and the gain in the next ten years, up to 1830, was 470,967. In 1830, the number was 2,009,031; and the gain, up to 1840, was only 478,113. If the ratio had remained as in the preceding decennial period, the increase would have been at least one hundred thousand more. The number manumitted was too inconsiderable to affect the result.

In the beginning of the Lecture, Mr. Fisher labors to prove that the commerce and manufactures of the South, originally far more extensive and flourishing than those of the North, were destroyed by the Protective Policy. This he regards as a great injury and wrong. "When, therefore, her statesmen," he says, "reflect on the great commercial and manufacturing prosperity of their country in the days of direct taxation, and behold her dilapidated cities and deserted harbors, under the change of system, is it wonderful that they have made the halls of Congress eloquent with the ruin and wrong they have suffered?" In the next breath he talks of the "triumph of Southern enterprise and capital, in the accumulation of wealth, bring established," &c.

In one place he laments the loss of flourishing cities, and in the next congratulates the South upon being rid of those pestilential dens of vice. I have paid little attention to his statistics on this head, as they have nothing to do with the relative wealth of the North and South. But Dr. Bailey has demonstrated that his facts and reasonings are as false and shallow in this respect as in every other. I subjoin an extract from his article, which is all-sufficient for this branch of the subject. It has recently come to my notice, and will save me some labor:

From the National Era of March 1, 1849.

"We cannot forbear noticing a few more groundless statements in the Lecture. The author denounces cities as the great destroyers of human life—cities, the boast of the North. The mortality in them, he assumes, is appalling; and he endeavors to maintain this position by a few stray statistics, of no force whatever.

"The following table, by E. C. Seaman, in his 'Progress of Nations,' is the result of a laborious and careful analysis of data furnished by the census, and by the bills of mortality of this country and others:

<i>Proportion of children, born alive, that die under five years of age, in the cities of the</i>				
	<i>Free States, North.</i>	<i>Slave States, South.</i>	<i>Slave States, S. W.</i>	
Under one year	16 per cent.	12 per cent.	8 per cent.	
One to two years	7 "	6 "	6 "	
Two to five years	5 "	6 "	10 "	
In the country	15 "	15 "	15 "	
In the city	16 2-3 "	16 "	16 "	

"So much for the appalling waste of life in cities. The difference in favor of the country is slight. It will be observed that the mortality of children under one year is twice as great in the cities of the free States, as in those of the Southern slave States; but that, in children from two to five years, the proportion is exactly reversed; and this disproportionate mortality continues in subsequent ages. Mr. Fisher, however, from a careless calculation of insufficient statistics, arrives at the conclusion that the mortality of the males at the North is far greater than at the South; and this he charges upon the disproportionate amount of vice in the free States. We commend to his notice the following table, founded upon calculations, compiled with a carefulness he would do well to imitate, and comprehending a range of data with which he certainly is not familiar:

Estimated per cent. of mortality, during each period, from 1790 to 1850, exclusive of about one tenth of one per cent., caused by the Asiatic cholera in 1832 to 1834.

	1790 to 1800	1800 to 1810	1810 to 1820	1820 to 1830	1830 to 1840	1840 to 1850
Free States	12.12	11.42	10.52	10.12	9.60	9.10
Northern slave States	18.10	18.05	18.00	17.95	17.00	17.85
Southern slave States	25.00	24.80	24.50	24.20	23.90	23.80

"The mortality in all the countries of Europe, it is stated, except Turkey, Spain, and Portugal, and part of Italy, has declined within the past three centuries—in Great Britain, more

than one third part. In the free States of this country, the abatement during the last sixty years is one-fourth, while in the Southern States it is scarcely noticeable; and the table, too, shows that the mortality in the free States is about one-half what it is in the Northern slave States, and not near one half what it is in the Southern slave States."

In conclusion, I must apologize for the great length of this article. Mr. Fisher has dealt in bold assertions, founded on false assumptions of fact. To render the evidence of their falsity tangible and undeniable, has cost me many hours of patient investigation of statistics, as well as elaborate statement. Abstract truth or falsehood may be enunciated in a sentence; but to establish the one or overthrow the other by argument is the labor of pages. A man may tell more lies in an hour (if Mr. Fisher will pardon the illustration) than can be refuted in a week. I might have been more brief, had I have had the time to revise and methodize the facts and arguments; but the latter half of the article I have not had time even to cast my eye over, before committing it to the press. These considerations, together with the great importance of the subject, and the value of accurate and full information, will excuse me for trespassing so long upon the attention of the public.

Since writing the foregoing article, I have carefully examined the census returns of Virginia. I find that the loose guesses of the Norfolk Convention as to commercial capital, upon which I had relied, in the absence of more authentic information, were much too large. Instead of Virginia having \$43,000,000 invested in foreign and domestic commerce, she has only \$21,197,803—less than half the amount I had given her credit for. I made no mention of her manufacturing capital. I find it, including mills, to amount to only \$11,360,871. Subtracting \$21,802,177 of commercial capital overstated, and adding \$11,360,877 manufacturing capital omitted, and we have \$272,658,700 for the value of Virginia. But, lest I may have been niggardly in allowing for articles not enumerated, such as household furniture, &c., I am willing that my former estimate should stand, viz: \$283,000,000.